arXiv:1611.05108v1 [math.FA] 16 Nov 2016

WEAK LOG MAJORIZATION AND DETERMINANTAL INEQUALITIES

TIN-YAU TAM[1] AND PINGPING ZHANG[2*]

ABSTRACT. Denote by $\mathbb{P}_n$ the set of $n\times n$ positive definite matrices. Let $D = D_1\oplus\cdots\oplus D_k$, where $D_1\in\mathbb{P}_{n_1},\ldots,D_k\in\mathbb{P}_{n_k}$ with $n_1+\cdots+n_k=n$. Partition $C\in\mathbb{P}_n$ according to $(n_1,\ldots,n_k)$ so that $\operatorname{Diag} C = C_1\oplus\cdots\oplus C_k$. We prove the following weak log majorization result:

$$\lambda(C_1^{-1}D_1\oplus\cdots\oplus C_k^{-1}D_k)\prec_{w\log}\lambda(C^{-1}D),$$

where $\lambda(A)$ denotes the vector of eigenvalues of $A\in\mathbb{C}_{n\times n}$. The inequality does not hold if one replaces the vectors of eigenvalues by the vectors of singular values, i.e.,

$$s(C_1^{-1}D_1\oplus\cdots\oplus C_k^{-1}D_k)\prec_{w\log}s(C^{-1}D)$$

is not true. As an application, we provide a generalization of a determinantal inequality of Matic [5, Theorem 1.1]. In addition, we obtain a weak majorization result which is complementary to a determinantal inequality of Choi [2, Theorem 2] and give a weak log majorization open question.

1. INTRODUCTION

Denote by $\mathbb{C}_{n\times n}$ the set of $n\times n$ complex matrices and $\mathbb{P}_n\subset\mathbb{C}_{n\times n}$ the set of $n\times n$ positive definite matrices. For $A\in\mathbb{C}_{n\times n}$, we denote by A^* and $|A| = (A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ the conjugate transpose and the positive semidefinite part of A, respectively. Given $n\times n$ Hermitian matrices A and B, $A\le B$ means that $B-A$ is positive semidefinite.

For $x=(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n)$, $y=(y_1,y_2,\ldots,y_n)\in\mathbb{R}^n$, let $x^{\downarrow}=(x_{[1]},x_{[2]},\ldots,x_{[n]})$ denote a rearrangement of the components of x such that $x_{[1]}\ge x_{[2]}\ge\cdots\ge x_{[n]}$. The notation $x\le y$ means that $x_{[i]}\le y_{[i]}$, $i=1,\ldots,n$. We say that x is weakly majorized by y, denoted by $x\prec_w y$, if $\sum_{j=1}^k x_{[j]}\le\sum_{j=1}^k y_{[j]}$ for all $1\le k\le n$. We say that x is majorized by y, denoted by $x\prec y$, if $x\prec_w y$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n x_j=\sum_{j=1}^n y_j$.

Let $\mathbb{R}_+$ denote the set of all positive real numbers and $\mathbb{R}_+^n=(\mathbb{R}_+)^n$. Given $x,y\in(\mathbb{R}_+)^n$, we say that x is weakly log-majorized by y, written as $x\prec_{w\log}y$, if $\prod_{i=1}^k x_{[i]}\le\prod_{i=1}^k y_{[i]}$, for $k=1,\ldots,n$; x is log-majorized by y, denoted by $x\prec_{\log}y$, if $x\prec_{w\log}y$ and $\prod_{j=1}^n x_j=\prod_{j=1}^n y_j$.

Let $A\in\mathbb{P}_n$. Denote by $\lambda(A)=(\lambda_1(A),\ldots,\lambda_n(A))\in\mathbb{R}_+^n$ the vector of eigenvalues of A and we may arrange the eigenvalues in non-increasing order $\lambda_1(A)\ge\cdots\ge\lambda_n(A)$.

Matic [5, Theorem 1.1] proved the following determinantal inequality. Zhang [8] and Choi [2] gave two different proofs, respectively. We state the theorem using Choi's version.

Theorem 1.1. (Matic [5]) Let $C\in\mathbb{P}_n$ and $D=D_1\oplus\cdots\oplus D_k$, where $D_1\in\mathbb{P}_{n_1},\ldots,D_k\in\mathbb{P}_{n_k}$ with $n_1+\cdots+n_k=n$. Partition C according to $(n_1,\ldots,n_k)$ so that $\operatorname{Diag}C=C_1\oplus\cdots\oplus C_k$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 15A45.

Key words and phrases. Positive definite matrices, determinant, weak log majorization, weak majorization.

*Corresponding author.

in which $\operatorname{Diag} C$ is the main block diagonal of C. Then

$$\det(I_{n_1}+C_1^{-1}D_1)\cdots\det(I_{n_k}+C_k^{-1}D_k)\le\det(I_n+C^{-1}D). \tag{1.1}$$

In this paper we obtain the following weak log majorization result where C and D are given as in Theorem 1.1:

$$\lambda(C_1^{-1}D_1\oplus\cdots\oplus C_k^{-1}D_k)\prec_{w\log}\lambda(C^{-1}D). \tag{1.2}$$

We note that (1.2) does not hold if one replaces the vectors of eigenvalues by the vectors of singular values.

We would like to point out that (1.2) is more fundamental than (1.1). In order to see that we will first derive the following determinantal inequality as an application of (1.2):

$$\det(I_{n_1}+(C_1^{-1}D_1)^p)\cdots\det(I_{n_k}+(C_k^{-1}D_k)^p)\le\det(I_n+(C^{-1}D)^p),\quad p\ge 0, \tag{1.3}$$

which is evidently a generalization of (1.1). We will show by example that (1.3) is not true when $p<0$.

By looking at (1.3) as a generalization of (1.1), one might ask whether the following two possible generalizations of (1.1) are true or not:

$$\det(I_{n_1}+|C_1^{-1}D_1|^p)\cdots\det(I_{n_k}+|C_k^{-1}D_k|^p)\le\det(I_n+|C^{-1}D|^p),\quad p\ge 0, \tag{1.4}$$

and

$$\det(I_{n_1}+C_1^{-p}D_1^p)\cdots\det(I_{n_k}+C_k^{-p}D_k^p)\le\det(I_n+C^{-p}D^p),\quad p\ge 0. \tag{1.5}$$

Both answers are negative and we will provide a counterexample for both inequalities.

Choi [2, Theorem 2] obtained the following determinantal inequality:

Theorem 1.2. (Choi [2]) Let $A_i\in\mathbb{P}_n$, $i=1,\dots,m$, and $\operatorname{Diag} A_i=A_i^{(1)}\oplus\cdots\oplus A_i^{(k)}$, where $A_i^{(j)}\in\mathbb{P}_{n_j}$ for $i=1,\dots,m$, $j=1,\dots,k$.

$$\det\left(\sum_{i=1}^m(A_i^{(1)})^{-1}\right)\cdots\det\left(\sum_{i=1}^m(A_i^{(k)})^{-1}\right)\le\det\left(\sum_{i=1}^m A_i^{-1}\right). \tag{1.6}$$

We present a weak majorization inequality which is complementary to (1.6) and pose a weak log majorization open problem.

2. Weak log majorization and generalization of Matic's determinantal inequality

Regarding (1.3), one may ask whether $(C^{-1}D)^p$ is well defined or not when $p\in\mathbb{R}$. The question makes sense as we know that X^p is not necessarily defined for a general matrix $X\in\mathbb{C}_{n\times n}$. However, we can define X^p when X is hyperbolic, i.e., X is diagonalizable with positive eigenvalues. Let $\mathbb{H}_n$ be the set of all hyperbolic matrices in $\mathbb{C}_{n\times n}$ and $\mathbb{D}_n$ be the set of all diagonalizable matrices in $\mathbb{C}_{n\times n}$ with real eigenvalues. We claim that the exponential map $\exp:\mathbb{D}_n\to\mathbb{H}_n$ is bijective. It is surjective since each $X\in\mathbb{H}_n$ can be written as $X=SDS^{-1}$ for some nonsingular S, where $D=\operatorname{diag}(e^{\lambda_1},\dots,e^{\lambda_n})$ and $\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n\in\mathbb{R}$. Set $Y:=S(\log D)S^{-1}$, where $\log D:=\operatorname{diag}(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n)$. Note that

$$e^Y=e^{S(\log D)S^{-1}}=S(e^{\log D})S^{-1}=SDS^{-1}=X.$$

We are going to show that exp is injective. Let $Y_1,Y_2\in\mathbb{D}_n$ such that $e^{Y_1}=e^{Y_2}$. Let $P_1D_1P_1^{-1}=Y_1$ and $P_2D_2P_2^{-1}=Y_2$, where D_1 and D_2 are diagonal with diagonal entries arranged in non-increasing order. Taking exponentials of both sides yields $P_1e^{D_1}P_1^{-1}=$

$P_2e^{D_2}P_2^{-1}$ and thus $D_1 = D_2 = D$, say, by spectrum consideration. Write $D := d_1I_{n_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus d_kI_{n_k}$, where $d_1 > \cdots > d_k$. Set $Q = P_1^{-1}P_2$. So $e^DQ = Qe^D$ and hence $Q = Q_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Q_k$, where $Q_i \in \mathbb{C}_{n_i\times n_i}$. Thus $DQ = QD$, i.e., $DP_1^{-1}P_2 = P_1^{-1}P_2D$, which implies that $Y_1 = Y_2$. So we conclude that the map $\exp : \mathbb{D}_n \to \mathbb{H}_n$ is bijective. Now given $X \in \mathbb{H}_n$, define $X^p := e^{pY}$, $p \in \mathbb{R}$, where Y is the unique matrix in $\mathbb{D}_n$ such that $X = e^Y$. Explicitly, if we write $X = S\mathrm{diag}\,(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n)S^{-1}$ for some nonsingular $S \in \mathbb{C}_{n\times n}$, where $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$ are the eigenvalues of X in any order, then $X^p := S\mathrm{diag}\,(\xi_1^p, \ldots, \xi_n^p)S^{-1}$ since $Y = S\mathrm{diag}\,(\log \xi_1, \ldots, \log \xi_n)S^{-1}$.

Let us get back to the well-definedness of $(C^{-1}D)^p$, $p \in \mathbb{R}$, regarding (1.3). Note that $C^{-1}, D \in \mathbb{P}_n$. Given $A, B \in \mathbb{P}_n$, the product AB is hyperbolic though it may not be in $\mathbb{P}_n$. It is because that AB is similar to $B^{1/2}ABB^{-1/2} = B^{1/2}AB^{1/2} \in \mathbb{P}_n$, which is unitarily similar to a positive diagonal matrix. Hence $AB = P\mathrm{diag}\,(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n)P^{-1}$, for some nonsingular $P \in \mathbb{C}_{n\times n}$, where $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$ so that $(AB)^p = P\mathrm{diag}\,(\gamma_1^p, \ldots, \gamma_n^p)P^{-1}$, $p \in \mathbb{R}$.

Now we give our main result as follows.

Theorem 2.1. Under the conditions as in Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\lambda(C_1^{-1}D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus C_k^{-1}D_k) \prec_{w\,\log} \lambda(C^{-1}D). \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the case when $D = I_n$:

$$\lambda(C_1^{-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus C_k^{-1}) \prec_{w\,\log} \lambda(C^{-1}). \tag{2.2}$$

The reason is that

$$\lambda(C^{-1}D) = \lambda((D^{-1/2}CD^{-1/2})^{-1})$$

and

$$\mathrm{Diag}\,(D^{-1/2}CD^{-1/2}) = (D_1^{-1/2}C_1D_1^{-1/2}) \oplus \cdots \oplus (D_k^{-1/2}C_kD_k^{-1/2}).$$

Thus (2.1) is equivalent to

$$\lambda((\mathrm{Diag}\,(D^{-1/2}CD^{-1/2}))^{-1}) \prec_{w\,\log} \lambda((D^{-1/2}CD^{-1/2})^{-1})$$

so it is sufficient to show (2.2). By a result of Ky Fan [4, p.308] we have

$$\lambda(C_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus C_k) \prec \lambda(C). \tag{2.3}$$

It is known that [4, p.165] for any convex function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, if $x \prec y$, where $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n), y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$(f(x_1), f(x_2), \ldots, f(x_n)) \prec_w (f(y_1), f(y_2), \ldots, f(y_n)).$$

Since $f(x) = x^{-p}$, where $p > 0$, is convex on $(0, +\infty)$, by (2.3), we have

$$\lambda(C_1^{-p} \oplus \cdots \oplus C_k^{-p}) \prec_w \lambda(C^{-p}), \quad p > 0. \tag{2.4}$$

For m positive numbers $a_1, \ldots, a_m$, their power mean of order r is defined by

$$M_r(a) := \left(\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m a_i^r\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}$$

and it is known that $\lim_{r\to 0^+} M_r(a) = (\prod_{i=1}^m a_i)^{\frac{1}{m}}$ (see [3, p.15]). Applying this to (2.4) leads to

$$\lambda(C_1^{-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus C_k^{-1}) \prec_{w\,\log} \lambda(C^{-1}),$$

i.e., (2.2). Thus, we complete the proof. □

We now give an example to show that (2.1) may not be true if $D \in \mathbb{P}_n$ is not in diagonal block form, where $\operatorname{Diag} D = D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus D_k$, and $D_1 \in \mathbb{P}_{n_1}, \ldots, D_k \in \mathbb{P}_{n_k}$ with $n_1 + \cdots + n_k = n$.

Example 2.2. Let

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 14 & 8 & 9 & 8 \\ 8 & 12 & 7 & 7 \\ 9 & 7 & 10 & 8 \\ 8 & 7 & 8 & 8 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 14 & 8 \\ 8 & 12 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 10 & 8 \\ 8 & 8 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 11 & 12 & 6 & 11 \\ 12 & 16 & 7 & 12 \\ 6 & 7 & 5 & 6 \\ 11 & 12 & 6 & 14 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 11 & 12 \\ 12 & 16 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 6 \\ 6 & 14 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Matlab,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(C^{-1}D) &= (4.8921, 1.0664, 0.3433, 0.1772), \\ \lambda(C_1^{-1}D_1) &= (1.3488, 0.2281), \\ \lambda(C_2^{-1}D_2) &= (4.8080, 0.4420). \end{aligned}$$

So $\lambda(C_1^{-1}D_1 \oplus C_2^{-1}D_2) \not\prec_{w \log} \lambda(C^{-1}D)$ by considering the products of the first two largest entries of both sides.

Remark 2.3. One cannot replace the weak log majorization by the log majorization in (2.1). For example let C, D_1, D_2 be given in Example 2.2, and $D := D_1 \oplus D_2$. Note that

$$\lambda(C_1^{-1}D_1 \oplus C_2^{-1}D_2) \not\prec_{\log} \lambda(C^{-1}D)$$

as $\det(C_1^{-1}D_1)\det(C_2^{-1}D_2) = 0.6538 \neq 2.1717 = \det(C^{-1}D)$ by Matlab.

Remark 2.4. Taking $D = I_n$ in Theorem 2.1, we easily obtain

$$\prod_{i=m}^{n} \lambda_i(C) \leq \prod_{i=m}^{n} \lambda_i(C_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus C_k), \quad m = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{2.5}$$

(2.5) implies Fischer inequality.

Remark 2.5. Let $C \in \mathbb{P}_n$ be given as in Theorem 1.1 and $D \in \mathbb{C}_{n\times n}$ be positive semidefinite with $\operatorname{Diag} D = D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus D_k$. Wang, Xi, and Zhang [6, Theorem 4] proved

$$\lambda(C_1^{-1}D_1 \oplus 0) \leq \lambda(C^{-1}D).$$

In Example 2.2, one can see that $(\lambda(C_i^{-1}D_i), 0, 0) \leq \lambda(C^{-1}D)$, $i = 1, 2$. Theorem 2.1 complements this result when $D \in \mathbb{P}_n$ is in diagonal block form.

Next we give an application of Theorem 2.1 as follows.

Theorem 2.6. Under the conditions as in Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\det(I_{n_1} + (C_1^{-1}D_1)^p) \cdots \det(I_{n_k} + (C_k^{-1}D_k)^p) \leq \det(I_n + (C^{-1}D)^p), \quad p \geq 0. \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. When $p = 0$, it is trivial so we may assume $p > 0$. By Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\log \lambda(C_1^{-1}D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus C_k^{-1}D_k) \prec_w \log \lambda(C^{-1}D). \tag{2.7}$$

Let us recall a known result [4, p.167] for any increasing convex function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. If $x \prec_w y$, where $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n), y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$(f(x_1), f(x_2), \ldots, f(x_n)) \prec_w (f(y_1), f(y_2), \ldots, f(y_n)).$$

Since the function $f(x) = \log(1+e^{px})$, where $p > 0$, is an increasing convex function, applying the function to (2.7) gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log(1 + (\lambda_i(C_1^{-1}D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus C_k^{-1}D_k))^p) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log(1 + (\lambda_i(C^{-1}D))^p),$$

i.e.,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log(1 + \lambda_i((C_1^{-1}D_1)^p \oplus \cdots \oplus (C_k^{-1}D_k)^p)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log(1 + \lambda_i((C^{-1}D)^p)).$$

The desired result follows by taking exponential on both sides. □

Remark 2.7. When $p = 1$, Theorem 2.6 reduces to Theorem 1.1.

In the next example we show that (2.6) is not true when $p < 0$.

Example 2.8. Let $n = 2$, $n_1 = n_2 = 1$, $D = I_2$,

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{P}_{2\times 2}, \quad C_1 = C_2 = 3.$$

Direct computation gives $\lambda(C) = \{5, 1\}$. Let $p < 0$ and set $q := -p$ so $q > 0$. Then

$$\lambda(C^q) = \{5^q, 1\}, \quad C_1^q = C_2^q = 3^q.$$

Let

$$f(q) := \det(I_2 + C^q) = (1 + 5^q)(1 + 1) = 2 + 2 \cdot 5^q$$

and

$$g(q) := \det(1 + C_1^q) \det(1 + C_2^q) = (1 + 3^q)^2 = 1 + 2 \cdot 3^q + 3^{2q}.$$

We are going to show that $g(q) > f(q)$ for all $q > 0$. Let $f(x) = 2 \cdot 3^x + 3^{2x} - 2 \cdot 5^x - 1$. Since

$$f'(x) = (3^x + 9^x) \ln 9 - 2 \cdot 5^x \ln 5 \geq 2\sqrt{3^x \cdot 9^x} \ln 9 - 2 \cdot 5^x \ln 5 > 0, \quad \text{for } x > 0,$$

we have $f(x) > f(0) = 0$ when $x > 0$. Thus (2.6) is not true when $p < 0$.

We would like to point out that (2.6) is no longer true if $D \in \mathbb{P}_n$ is not in diagonal block form. We give an example to show this as follows.

Example 2.9. Let $p = 1$, $n = 2$, $n_1 = n_2 = 1$,

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 12 & 7 \\ 7 & 10 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_1 = 12, \quad C_2 = 10,$$

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 16 & 7 \\ 7 & 5 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_1 = 16, \quad D_2 = 5.$$

Direct computation gives

$$\det(I_2 + C^{-1}D) \approx 3.1549 < 3.5 = \det(1 + C_1^{-1}D_1) \det(1 + C_2^{-1}D_2).$$

Next we will show that inequalities (1.4) and (1.5) are not true and we first give a counterexample to the following inequality.

$$\det(D_1^{-2}+C_1^{-2})\cdots\det(D_k^{-2}+C_k^{-2})\le\det(D^{-2}+C^{-2}), \tag{2.8}$$

where $C, D, C_i, D_i, i=1,\dots,k$, are given as in Theorem 1.1.

Example 2.10. Let

$$C=\begin{pmatrix}16.25 & 21 & 10 & 12.5\\ 21 & 39.75 & 20.75 & 28.5\\ 10 & 20.75 & 22.5 & 27.75\\ 12.5 & 28.5 & 27.75 & 39.25\end{pmatrix},\quad C_1=\begin{pmatrix}16.25 & 21\\ 21 & 39.75\end{pmatrix},$$

$$C_2=\begin{pmatrix}22.5 & 27.75\\ 27.75 & 39.25\end{pmatrix},\quad D=\begin{pmatrix}14.7 & 15 & 0 & 0\\ 15 & 15.8 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0.25 & 0.4\\ 0 & 0 & 0.4 & 0.8\end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$D_1=\begin{pmatrix}14.7 & 15\\ 15 & 15.8\end{pmatrix},\quad D_2=\begin{pmatrix}0.25 & 0.4\\ 0.4 & 0.8\end{pmatrix}.$$

By Matlab

$$\det(D^{-2}+C^{-2})=51.0669<54.6523=\det(D_1^{-2}+C_1^{-2})\det(D_2^{-2}+C_2^{-2}).$$

Therefore, (2.8) is false.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\det(I_n+|C^{-1}D|^2) &= \det(I_n+DC^{-2}D)=\det(D(D^{-2}+C^{-2})D)\\ &= \det(D^{-2}+C^{-2})\cdot(\det D)^2,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\det(I_{n_1}+|C_1^{-1}D_1|^2)\cdots\det(I_{n_k}+|C_k^{-1}D_k|^2)\\ =\;&\det(D_1(D_1^{-2}+C^{-2})D_1)\cdots\det(D_k(D_k^{-2}+C_k^{-2})D_k)\\ =\;&\det(D_1^{-2}+C_1^{-2})\cdot\det(D_1)^2\cdots\det(D_k^{-2}+C_k^{-2})\cdot(\det D_k)^2\\ =\;&\det(D_1^{-2}+C_1^{-2})\cdots\det(D_k^{-2}+C_k^{-2})\cdot(\det D)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since (2.8) is false, (1.4) is invalid.

Note that

$$\det(I_n+C^{-2}D^2)=\det((D^{-2}+C^{-2})D^2)=\det(D^{-2}+C^{-2})\cdot(\det D)^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\det(I_{n_1}+C_1^{-2}D_1^2)\cdots\det(I_{n_k}+C_k^{-2}D_k^2)\\ =\;&\det(D_1^{-2}+C_1^{-2})\cdot\det(D_1)^2\cdots\det(D_k^{-2}+C_k^{-2})\cdot(\det D_k)^2\\ =\;&\det(D_1^{-2}+C_1^{-2})\cdots\det(D_k^{-2}+C_k^{-2})\cdot(\det D)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since (2.8) is false, (1.5) is also invalid.

Remark 2.11. Since (1.4) is not true, the vectors of eigenvalues cannot be replaced by the vectors of singular values in (2.1) from the proof in Theorem 2.6. In other words,

$$s(C_1^{-1}D_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus C_k^{-1}D_k) \not\prec_{w\log} s(C^{-1}D),$$

where $C, D, C_i, D_i, i = 1, \ldots, k$, are given as in Theorem 1.1.

3. Weak majorization complementary to Choi's determinantal inequality

Let us first recall a result from [7, Theorem 7.13].

Lemma 3.1. Let $A \in \mathbb{C}_{n\times n}$ be positive semidefinite and let $[A]$ be the principal submatrix of A corresponding to some fixed rows and columns. Assuming that the inverses involved exist, we have

$$[A]^{-1} \le [A^{-1}].$$

Theorem 3.2. Under the conditions as in Theorem 1.2, we have

$$\lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{(1)})^{-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{(k)})^{-1}\right)^p \prec_w \lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^m A_i^{-1}\right)^p, \quad p \ge 1. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. By (2.3), we have

$$\lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{-1})^{(1)} \oplus \cdots \oplus \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{-1})^{(k)}\right) \prec \lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^m A_i^{-1}\right). \tag{3.2}$$

By Lemma 3.1 and Weyl's monotonicity theorem [1, p.63], we have

$$\lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{(1)})^{-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{(k)})^{-1}\right) \le \lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{-1})^{(1)} \oplus \cdots \oplus \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{-1})^{(k)}\right). \tag{3.3}$$

Now (3.2) and (3.3) lead to

$$\lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{(1)})^{-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{(k)})^{-1}\right) \prec_w \lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^m A_i^{-1}\right).$$

The desired result follows by the fact that $f(x) = x^p$, $p > 1$, is increasing and convex on $(0, +\infty)$. □

Remark 3.3. Choi's determinantal inequality (1.6) is equivalent to the following:

$$\det\left(\sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{(1)})^{-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{(k)})^{-1}\right)^p \le \det\left(\sum_{i=1}^m A_i^{-1}\right)^p, \quad p > 0.$$

Thus, Theorem 3.2 is a complement to Theorem 1.2.

It is natural to ask whether (3.1) holds for $0 < p < 1$? By Theorem 3.2 and the proof of Theorem 2.1, this question is equivalent to the following weak log majorization question:

Question 3.4. Under the conditions as in Theorem 1.2,

$$\lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{(1)})^{-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \sum_{i=1}^m (A_i^{(k)})^{-1}\right) \prec_{w\log} \lambda\left(\sum_{i=1}^m A_i^{-1}\right)? \tag{3.4}$$

When $n = 2, k = 2, n_1 = n_2 = 1$, (3.4) holds by (1.6) and (3.1). The other cases are open. We would like to point out that we performed computer experiments and the outcomes are consistent with the weak log majorization given in (3.4).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Acknowlegements

The second author is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant numbers: 11601054, 11671060), the Basic and Advanced Research Project of CQ CSTC (Grant number: cstc2016jcyjA0466), the Science and Technology Research Project of Chongqing Municipal Education Commission (Grant number: KJ201600644621) and the Youth Science Research Project of Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications (Grant number: A2014-104).

References

[1] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis,* Springer, New York, 1997.
[2] D. Choi, Determinantal inequalities of positive definite matrices, Math. Inequal. Appl. **19** (2016), 167-172.
[3] G. Hardy, J.E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, *Inequalities,* Cambridge University Press, 1991.
[4] A.W. Marshall, I. Olkin, B.C. Arnold, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications,* Second Edition, Springer, 2011.
[5] I. Matic, Inequalities with determinants of perturbed positive matrices, Linear Algebra Appl. **449** (2014), 166-174.
[6] B.Y. Wang, B.Y. Xi and F. Zhang, Some inequalities for sum and product of positive semidefinite matrices, Linear Algebra Appl. **293** (1999), 39-49.
[7] F. Zhang, *Matrix Theory: Basic Results and Techniques,* Second Edition, Springer, 2011.
[8] P. Zhang, Extension of Matic's results, Linear Algebra Appl. **486** (2015), 328-334.

[1] Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849, USA
E-mail address: tamtiny@auburn.edu

[2] School of Science, Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Chongqing, 400065, China
E-mail address: zhpp04010248@126.com